



Seattle Public Utilities CSO Long-Term Control Plan Sounding Board

Criteria Comments/Responses

At its January 25th meeting, the Sounding Board offered up a number of comments regarding the evaluation of CSO alternatives for Planning Area #1 – the Ballard/Fremont area. Here is a summary of Sounding Board comments and the actions that will be taken as a result.

What You Said	How We'll Respond
1. The criterion related to “Sustainable Seattle” isn’t comprehensive enough. You are looking at carbon emissions for pumping, but what about the carbon emissions during construction of the projects? How is that accounted for?	You are right. The City’s Sustainability policy includes much more than just carbon emissions. We’ve attached it here. We will go through the alternatives and see how they match up to the sustainability goals identified by the City of Seattle.
2. The criteria on “meeting permitting requirements” doesn’t go far enough. Where is the actual measure of improvements to water quality? The actual effects on the environment and how those will be remediated through CSO control? We should be thinking about water quality, living resources, salmon – more water-related elements.	You are right. Improvements to water quality are a little difficult to measure, because right outside every CSO outfall there is a “mixing zone” and it is difficult to quantify the effects of the CSO on the specific water quality in that area. But, what we CAN do is quantify the pollutants that are not in that water; the type and quantity of the pollutants that have been removed due to CSO facilities. We will provide that information to the Sounding Board.

What You Said	How We'll Respond
<p>3. The criteria about short and long-term benefits and impacts don't do an adequate job. It seems like there is a detriment for having a pocket park or green infrastructure, and that shouldn't be the case. More green infrastructure adds value to the surrounding properties. This is what people want. This is a good thing. Yes, there will be some impacts of trucks going in and out for maintenance, but the benefits clearly outweigh the negative impacts. That needs to be reflected better in both the criteria and the ratings/weightings.</p>	<p>You are right. We have clearly heard from the Sounding Board that "green is good" and should be seen as a positive amenity. We probably overstated the long-term impacts of raingarden and pocket park maintenance on the community. After all, parks get maintained all the time with trucks and equipment, and people still enjoy the parks. We will modify this criterion and its measures.</p>
<p>4. Do the criteria really go far enough in anticipating new water quality regulations that might be put into effect by 2025? Are we really looking out far enough, and do these alternatives fully anticipate both the flows we will have at that time and any new regulations? For example, if we have to add ultraviolet lights or other disinfection technologies, will we have room for that at these storage facilities?</p>	<p>Yes, we do think we have looked pretty far out, and we have considered what additional pollutants might be regulated in the future. We'll take another look at our "risk register" however, and make sure we have carefully thought through these possibilities. We will provide this information to the Sounding Board.</p>
<p>5. A lot of this is going to depend on the actual neighborhood where you are trying to locate these facilities. In some places, parking is at a premium, so people won't want to lose parking spaces to raingardens. In other areas of the city, new parks can be threatening, as they can be crime areas. Alternatively, could housing be built over some of the storage tanks if a neighborhood needed it?</p>	<p>As we move ahead with the Long-Range Control Plan, we will be careful to note that final facility decisions will be made on a "site-by-site" basis. We can't make all of those determinations at this point, because we don't know specific proposed sites for the facilities. However, we could include a general policy statement in the LTCP that the City will look for all possible ways to pursue joint developments within neighborhoods, whether that be road improvements, parks, or other developments.</p>

What You Said	How We'll Respond
<p>6. We need to look harder at Seattle sustainability criteria. Maybe this is the kick in the pants we need to encourage people to use cars less. But we should be looking at this from an environmental perspective, not a social perspective. Maybe we do reduce parking but encourage public transportation moving towards sustainability.</p>	<p>Yes, as noted above, we will revise the criteria and the ratings to better reflect Sustainable Seattle goals.</p>
<p>7. How are you describing benefits to low income or minority communities? If you want to give them a benefit, give them jobs. They don't need parks, they need jobs. And, what is the city's priority and criteria around apprenticeship utilization.</p>	<p>These are both very good points. We will provide the Sounding Board with the City's hiring and contracting policies, and will make sure these get reflected in the Long-Term Control Plan, as well.</p>